



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

words from every point of view. Many new definitions of old words have been established, and not a few entirely new words have been added to the vocabulary of Old English.

Especial references to the historical personages connected with the battle of Maldon are found in Charters v (dated May 9, 957, and entitled *King Eadwig to Archbishop Oda*), vii (dated 980 to 988 and being a letter of Archbishop Dunstan to King Aedelred 'concerning certain estates belonging to the diocese of Cornwall'), viii (date 998: 'grant of land at Southam, etc., by King Aedelred to Ealdorman Leofwine'), and ix (date Apr. 15, 998: 'will of Leofwine, Wulfstan's son, in favour of Westminster Abbey'). That is to say, the several leaders at Maldon whose names are mentioned in these documents are discussed at length in the Notes. Among others we find *Adðelstan dux* (pp. 82-84), *Byrhtnoð dux* (85-88), *Aelfric dux* (120-121, and 123).

Of *Byrhtnoð dux* the editors say:

"This is, no doubt, the hero of Maldon. He signs from 956 to 990. Freeman (*Norman Conquest* i, 635) thinks that he is the *minister* of 967, an error for 972-3. He is clearly the *dux* who signs from 956 . . . Nothing is known of his family, except that his father was named Byrthelm (*Song of Maldon*, line 92). It is possible that he was related to Byrhtsige, son of Aetheling Beornod (Chron. A) or Berhtnoð (Chron. B, C, D), who fell in 905 fighting with the Aelgeling Aedelweard against King Edward . . . Brihtnoð of Maldon married Aelflæd, the youngest daughter of Aelfgar, who mentions her (not by name) in his will (C.S. iii, 215), in which Brihtnoð is clearly regarded as her husband. . . . That Aedelflæd, the sister-in-law of Byrhtnoð, was Aedelflæd æt Domerham is proved by her will, wherein she bequeaths land at Domerham. She is also the *una matrona* to whom King Edgar grants land at Chelsworth, co. Suffolk, in 962, as she bequeathed this estate to Aelflæd and Brihtnoð. The will of Aelflæd records that Rettendon [co. Essex] was her 'morning-gift,' so it is evident that Brihtnoð had possessions in Essex at the time of his marriage (*circa* 950). In Aelflæd's will, which was drawn up after Brihtnoð's death (991), a kinsman of his named Aedelmar is mentioned. . . . Out of all this (that is, discussion of Aedelmar's ancestry) nothing emerges clearly except the great probability that Brihtnoð's kinsman Aedelmar was the son of the chronicler Aedelweard, an undoubted scion of the royal house of Wessex. . . . Brihtnoð's sister's son, Wulfmæ, fell at Maldon (*Song of*

*Maldon*, line 113). Another relative of Brihtnoð's who distinguished himself in the battle, was the Mercian Aelfwine, son of Aelfric, and grandson of Ealdorman Ealhelm (lines 209 to 224). This is, no doubt, the Ealdorman Ealhelm who subscribes from 940 to 951. It may be noted that the Battle of Maldon, which was fought in 991 according to the chronicle, occurred on August 11, for the *Obitus Byrhtnoði Comitis* is given upon this day (iii. 2d Aug.) in an eleventh century calendar (Cott. Lib. D. xxviii)."

The lengthy note on *Aelfric dux* does not succeed in entirely clearing up the mystery of that Aelfric's identity, who is mentioned in *Maldon*, l. 209, but the conclusion arrived at seems to confirm the surmise of Crow (Notes, p. 22) that "the Aelfric was possibly the one mentioned by Freeman. *O.E. Hist.*, p. 230."

The editors think that the "chief interest" of the comparatively short "Will of Leofwine Wulfstan's son" (Chart. ix) has not yet been pointed out:

"It is the will of Leofwine, son of Wulfstan, an Essex land-owner, and it is dated nearly seven years later than the battle of Maldon. Now one of the heroes of this battle, the man who guarded the bridge, and who seemingly struck the first blow, was Wulfstan, the son of Ceola (cf. *Maldon* l. 74 *et seq.*). The last line (that is, 83, *pā hwile þe hī wæpna wealdan mōstōn*) seems to imply that the 'bitter bridge-warriors' fell fighting at their posts. In lines 152 sqq. Wulfmæ, the young, Wulfstan's ungrown son, distinguishes himself at Brihtnoð's side. It is highly probable that the testator was the son of the Wulfmæ, because Brihtnoð's force must have consisted principally of the local levies, and the testator's possessions were close to Maldon. It was probably this local connection of Wulfstan's that caused Brihtnoð to select him to guard the bridge."

WM. H. HULME.

Western Reserve University.

#### GERMAN LITERATURE.

*Inedita des Heinrich Kaufinger.* Herausgegeben von H. SCHMIDT-WARTENBERG. Germanic Studies, edited by the Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures, iii. The University of Chicago Press, 1897. 8vo, pp. xv, 56.

THE third number of the Germanic Studies issued by the University of Chicago is one of exceptional interest, both to the critical student of German literature, and to the lover of folk-

lore; to the former, because it raises new problems with regard to Heinrich Kaufringer; to the latter, because it furnishes a version of the marriage of the devil which antedates the best known Italian and German forms of the story from one hundred to one hundred and fifty years. We shall first give a short synopsis of the book, and then take up the two main points of interest just mentioned.

Professor Schmidt-Wartenberg begins his Introduction with an accurate description of the Berlin manuscript from which he has taken the poems. The codex was written by a Bavarian in 1472, and contains among two hundred and twenty-two poems of Heinrich Teichner, one by Conrad Vollstatter, and ten by Heinrich Kaufringer. Further on the editor calls due attention to the close connection existing between Teichner and Kaufringer, a circumstance which had escaped the notice of Karl Euling, who in 1888 published seventeen poems from a Munich manuscript under the title of 'Heinrich Kaufringers Gedichte.' Professor Schmidt-Wartenberg next discusses the bearing of the Berlin poems on those of the Munich codex, and although he does not admit the validity of all of Euling's arguments, he considers Kaufringer's authorship of all the poems established. In the second part of the Introduction the most important versions of the story of the marriage of the devil are surveyed, and a few remarks are made concerning the variants and possible sources of the other poems. A characterization of the language and the person of the poet is dispensed with, because Euling has furnished the one and promised the other. Some stylistic comments, however, will appear in connection with an edition of the poems of Teichner in the same codex. The text purposes to be in all essentials a diplomatic reproduction of the original. The poems vary in length from eighty to two hundred and fifty-eight lines of four stresses each, exceptions being rare. All were undoubtedly composed by Kaufringer because all close with the line:

"Also sprach Hainrich Kaufringer,"

a conclusion which occurs only in the last two poems, xvi and xvii, of Euling's collection,

<sup>1</sup> *Heinrich Kaufringers Gedichte*. Herausgegeben von Dr. Karl Euling. *Bibl. d. Litt. Vereins in Stuttgart*, 1888.

and hence makes it necessary to re-examine the evidence for Kaufringer's authorship of the other fifteen. The subjects of the pieces are stated in the index of the manuscript and repeated as titles, in some cases with additions such as: "So merck; So hör vnd mercke; So merck vnd guttz drauff," for the purpose of enlisting the particular attention of the hearer. The subjects and contents of the ten poems are in short as follows:

1. *Ain bösz alts ubels weib übersaygt den tuffel*. The assertion is proved by the story of the marriage of an old woman with the devil.

2. *Das man die wellt fliehen soll*. There is no escape from hell except by shunning the world which is wicked everywhere; Isaiah, John and St. Augustine testify to that. As at the close of a game of chess all the men are thrown into the same sack, high and low go to the same grave; only good works can save them from damnation.

3. *Von den vorsprechen*. A lamentation over the bad custom of hiring lawyers which had arisen in Bavaria and elsewhere, and a comical example of their cynic injustice told without a smile.

4. *Man soll vatter und mutter jnn eren hon*. An injunction of the commandment by means of a story which, as the editor explains, is a variant of a well-known fairy tale.

5. *Was nutz die gutten werck dem menschen bringen, die weil er jnn sunden leytt*. Good works alone cannot save men without repentance (compare no. 2!); they will give him, however, less pain in hell, riches and happiness on earth, and perhaps a life long enough to repent and be saved.

6. *Wa ain volck ungemainsam ist, das bringt grossen schaden*. The continual discord in the cities makes them succumb in time of war. This truth is emphasized by a story of thirty armed merchants who are overcome and plundered by only six robbers, in which the editor has rightly recognized a variant of the fable of the lion and the bulls.

7. *Die mann ettwan schälck vnd lecker hiess, die hayssent nun läufig vnd gescheyde*. A lamentation over the regard in which rogues and parasites are held, and over the undeserved punishments of the innocent.

8. *Von den syben tod sünden vnd den siben*

*gauben des hailigen gaists.* To seven diseases of the body correspond seven plagues of the soul and as many remedies of the Holy Spirit; for example, to leprosy, envy and hatred, genuine worth; to paralysis, slothfulness, divine strength; to lupus, gluttony, divine insight, etc.

9. *Von unmässigem adel zeyttliches leydens.* An almost frantic praise of suffering. Suffering even surpasses the cross, because God died on the cross in half a day, but suffered on earth for more than thirty years.

10. *Von den vier löchtern gotts vnd von vier geschlechten hie in der weltte.* Men are divided (logically?) into the rich and powerful, those in sadness and suffering, those who break his commandments, and those who obey them. To each of these classes God has destined a daughter of his in marriage who is to lead them to salvation; to the first Mercy; to the second Patience; to the third Repentance; to the last the Fear of God.—Even as short a survey as this may have shown the stern and bitter moralistic tone, and the strongly and strictly religious tendencies of the Berlin poems. It will scarcely be necessary to add that love adventures are excluded.

Proceeding now to the Munich poems we observe at once that they lack the homogeneous character of those described. xvi and xvii belong both by their closing line "Also sprach Heinrich Kaufringer" and by their contents directly to the Berlin poems. iii, i and ii agree with them in spirit. vi and viii contain illicit love affairs, but praise chastity. xiv is not free from objectionable details. xi, xii and xiii deserve to be called coarse. iv and v, and even more so vii, ix, x and xv, show a decided laxness of moral principles. Over and over again it is asserted that almost all men are deceived by their wives, and since Samson, Solomon, David and Aristotle had all fared ill, the lowly ones had better not be angry with them. The mayor of Erfurt is commended for his wisdom in accepting commercial advantages in expiation of the violation of his honor. Special praise is bestowed on a woman who manages to use the services of a pious and unsuspecting monk in order to arrive at her unholy ends.

Is the holder of these surprisingly liberal views identical with the one who wrote the

Berlin collection and xvi and xvii of the Munich poems? At least some of Euling's arguments that purpose to prove this identity appear untenable, or not cogent. Neither Professor Schmidt-Wartenberg nor the reviewer can accept the conclusions<sup>a</sup> built upon the double closing line of xiv and the "einheit und abgeschlossenheit der handschrift." Nor does the latter see in the phrases collected on pp. v and vi anything but evidence of a certain relationship of the poems i-xv among each other, for citations from the two unquestionable genuine poems xvi and xvii are wholly wanting. The argument taken from the "flickwerk von bestimmten lückenbüßern"<sup>3</sup> is but of small value, because these words and phrases are of frequent occurrence in some pieces and very rare in others, for example, in most of the Berlin poems. Solid ground is not reached until we come to the parallel expressions collected by Professor Schmidt-Wartenberg<sup>4</sup> which, as he says, might easily be multiplied, and to Euling's<sup>5</sup> more recent linguistic investigations. Both of these arguments, and more especially the latter, appear so strong that they alone would seem sufficient to establish Kaufringer's authorship of all the Munich poems against all doubts.

If then Kaufringer did write these poems, why did he fail to sign his name to i-xiii and xv, and how is it to be explained that he appears as a stern and sometimes fanatical moralist in some of his productions, and as a jovial and more than liberal-minded man in others? Euling<sup>6</sup> tries to dispose of the first difficulty by saying:

"Dass besonders die stücke erbaulichen inhalts xvi, xvii den namen des dichters tragen, während die lasciven gedichte ihn nicht nennen, ist natürlich,"

but this corresponds by no means to the facts. iii contains sentiments similar to those expressed in the Berlin poems 3, 6 and 7, only shorter and a trifle less bitter; the adultery which is mentioned is held up to scorn. i and ii are legends and differ from Prof. Schmidt-Wartenberg's poems only in the small extent

<sup>a</sup> *L. c.*, pp. iv f.      <sup>3</sup> *L. c.*, p. vi.      <sup>4</sup> Pp. vii, f.

<sup>5</sup> *Über Sprache und Verskunst Heinrich Kaufringers* von Dr. phil. Karl Euling. Programm, Lingen, 1892.

<sup>6</sup> *Heinrich Kaufringers Gedichte*, pp. 235 f.

of their moral and religious reflections, 2% and 7½% as against an aggregate of 33% in 1, 3, 4 and 6. vi, to be sure, relates a rape, but without objectionable details, and both the lady who is the principal character of the story, and the comments of the author are pure. viii introduces a man who is dissatisfied with his wife because she is rather stingy, and sets out to find a really harmonious and happy couple. Twice he believes to have found one, yet in one case the wife had been unfaithful in the past, and, therefore, had to take a draught from her lover's skull every night, and in the other the husband had to put up with the company of a sturdy peasant, concealed in a cellar, to protect himself from public scandal. The man is glad to return to his wife, and the poet commends faithful wives that have no greater fault than stinginess. Objectionable details do not occur. Hence there are five pieces not signed which are everything but 'lasciv.' On the other hand xiv, which, as Euling<sup>7</sup> holds, was signed by Kaufringer and not by a copyist, describes a rape and the sacrifice of a maiden's honor with a breadth of detail such as is found nowhere else. Since, therefore, lasciviousness or respectability of contents cannot have been the reason why two or three of the Munich poems were signed and the others were not, we must look for a better explanation. As it happens, Euling himself and Prof. Schmidt-Wartenberg have prepared the way for it. Euling<sup>8</sup> found that xvi and xvii, that is, the poems signed and after them iii, i and ii, poems we have classed next to them, too, are less perfect metrically than the other pieces of the Munich collection, and hence belong to an earlier period of the poet's life. Professor Schmidt-Wartenberg, on the other hand, has observed that the stereotype closing line: "Also sprach Hainrich Kaufringer" was written in imitation of Teichner. May we, therefore, not surmise that Kaufringer signed his poems while he was under Teichner's immediate influence, and left them unsigned at other times of his career, even when he might have been justly proud of them?

We have still to dwell a moment on the dif-

<sup>7</sup> *Heinrich Kaufringers Gedichte*, p. iv. The genuineness of both closing lines is asserted, but not proved.

<sup>8</sup> *Programm*, p. 11, below; p. 12, ll. 3-7.

ference in the moral attitude of the poet which we have noticed above. With nothing but the Munich collection before him, Friedrich Vogt<sup>9</sup> could say with an appearance of justice, that Kaufringer "zeitweilig auch eine fromme Miene aufsetzt." After the publication of the Berlin poems this will no longer do. For however much Kaufringer may have been influenced in his comments by the tone and trend of his sources, these comments express not only an honest, but sometimes even a passionate personal conviction. He does not seem to have been a man who could write in one strain to-day and in a directly opposite manner to-morrow, but it is much more probable that his greatly varying productions belong to different times of his life. We, therefore, must suppose that, as in the case of a classical writer, there was one period in his days when he was a stern moralist without any apparent sense of humor, who found fault with almost everything in the world, and hence embraced the heavenly things with so much the greater ardor, and, after a time of transition to which some of the poems seem to belong, another period when he allowed himself to be carried along by the current of his time, when he was genial and jovial, when he liked a good joke, and even occasionally a coarse one, when he took special pleasure in singing of the adventures of love more respectably than a good many others, but not discreetly enough to escape the eraser and the scissors of a zealous expurgator of the age of the Reformation.<sup>10</sup>

The last object of our attention was to be the poem containing the story of the marriage of the devil. It comprises two hundred and four lines, and its outline is as follows.

'Some one asked me what was the worst thing in this world, and I replied I knew of nothing as bad as wicked old women. If one of them takes a young husband he must be submissive to her or die an early death. Indeed, a wicked old woman drives away the evil one and gives him no peace, which I am going to prove presently. Once upon a time there was a wealthy old woman who was wicked beyond measure. A young man married her, but soon pined away and died on account of her contrariness. The devil felt sorry about

<sup>9</sup> Paul, *Grundriss der Germanischen Philologie* II, 1, p. 360.

<sup>10</sup> Euling, *Heinrich Kaufringers Gedichte*, p. ii.

this and assuming the shape of a young man married the old woman in order to avenge her former husband. Hardly, however, did she realize that he intended to worry her when she scolded and maltreated him so severely that he ran away from her. Out in the field he met a traveling student, told him who he was and what he had suffered from his wife, and suggested a compact. He would possess the king's daughter in the city and the student should come and cast him out and divide profits with him. They mutually pledged themselves to this agreement, but the devil had the secret intention of staying with the maiden. The princess became possessed, and the student who had staked his life that he could cure her, got into jeopardy of his life because the devil would not keep his promise. Finally an idea occurred to him. He went out of the princess' room and ordered the people who stood outside to rush up to the door with great noise. No sooner had he returned to the maiden, than the castle commenced to resound with the cries of the people. Quite frightened, the devil asked for the reason of this uproar, whereupon the student solemnly declared that his wife had come, and was rejoicing at having found him, and that she was going to lead him back to her home. The devil did not abide the arrival of his wife, but went to the infernal regions, hoping not to be disturbed. Hence I truly say: etc.'

Professor Schmidt-Wartenberg devotes almost half of his Introduction to a discussion of this poem and its variants. He rightly recognizes its connection with Machiavelli's Belfagor, utilizes Dunlop-Wilson, Landau, Regnier and other recent literature on the subject, and adds valuable information of his own. While he regrets that lack of further material prevents him from going still more deeply into the question, a stay at various great libraries and aid from others, has enabled the writer of these lines to acquaint himself with some thirty literary forms of the story exclusive of mere translations and reprints, and over fifty variants in modern folk-lore. A full treatment of all the various phases of this most interesting tale must be reserved for a more suitable opportunity; a few of the main points may be mentioned here.

The ultimate source of Kaufringer's and Machiavelli's tale has been found in India where, however, the trait of the marriage between the woman and the demon does not yet exist. The Indian tale appears without the marriage in Oriental literature, and with it in

Germany and Italy. The versions of France and England, with but one exception, are derived from Italy. The variants of Eastern Europe and adjoining parts point more frequently to Oriental than to Italian and German origin, and present some new developments.

The Latin manuscript's in which Dunlop-Wilson and Arlia have tried to find the source, or one of the sources, of the story of Belfagor, did not bear a close scrutiny. The old manuscript of St. Martin de Tours which, as Dunlop asserted and Wilson reiterated,<sup>11</sup> contained the story of Machiavelli and Brevio with 'merely a difference of names' seems to have never existed at all. As Professor Schmidt-Wartenberg indicates, Dunlop-Wilson's statement appears to have been taken from a notice of the poet Lainez. This notice, however, speaks of a Latin manuscript containing the marriage of the devil in five or six lines. Now, five or six lines could never have given the story of Machiavelli and Brevio which is fully fifty times as long, 'with merely a difference of names.' The supposed manuscript, therefore, was certainly nothing else than an old print of *Alterum Laurentii Abstemii Hecatomythium* bound in vellum. The ninety-fifth fable of this collection is eight lines long and entitled 'De daemone uxorem recusante.' Though this fable represents a not very happy evolution of the tale, and cannot have been a source of Machiavelli or Brevio, it offers the earliest testimony for the existence, on Italian soil, of the idea of a marriage of the devil. After this Latin manuscript has been disposed of, we come to Arlia's *Codex Laurentianus Antin.* 130 (B. ii, 217).<sup>12</sup> A careful perusal shows that none of its chapters contains any incident related to the story of Belfagor. The use of relics in casting out evil spirits, which is found in both, cannot prove interdependence because it was of too frequent occurrence in

<sup>11</sup> *History of Prose Fiction*, by John Colin Dunlop. A new edition by Henry Wilson. London, 1888. Vol. ii, pp. 186 ff. There are also a number of other errors in this paragraph of the otherwise quite meritorious work. In the citation of Jelinek's book, "Acad." should be omitted before "Leipzig"; the citation from the Talmud is 17b instead of 12; Machiavelli did not die 18 but 22 years before 1549; this story was not mutilated by Straparola; there do not occur three full moons in the Bohemian tale, but only one.

<sup>12</sup> *Propugnatores* xix, a p. 97. Arlia's citation "Antin. Laurenz. A. ii, 217" is incorrect.

those days. Also Holen's Latin version has had no influence on Belfagor.

As to whether Machiavelli, or Brevio, or Doni is the author of the famous story, a question which has never been entirely settled during the past three hundred and fifty years,<sup>13</sup> there are reasons never advanced yet, that prove Machiavelli's authorship beyond the shadow of a doubt. Whether Machiavelli in his turn drew on popular tradition only, or whether he had occasion to make use of the old French version of the *Lamentationes Matheoli* or some other written work, remains to be determined. Straparola's novel<sup>14</sup> which has generally been classed as a mutilated reproduction of Machiavelli's or Brevio's *Belfagor*, differs very materially from them inasmuch as it combines the marriage of the devil with another story which, likewise of Indian origin, has furnished the fundamental idea of Molière's *Le médecin malgré lui*. Sansovino's novel, on the other hand, is nothing but a reprint of Brevio's *Belfagor*, with a few insignificant additions or omissions, and one apparently accidental change of a word. In Germany Kaufringer's poem was followed by quite a number of Latin and German versions, among which we mention with Professor Schmidt-Wartenberg a master-song, a farce, and a carnival-play by Hans Sachs. Though none of these has been directly derived from Kaufringer, they all but one agree with him in two traits never found in Italy: the devil marries an old woman instead of a young lady, and he demands of the man who is to cast him out his share of the profits.

Wezel's Belphegor has hardly anything but the name in common with any other Belphegor or Belfagor. His hero does not go to Pluto or Lucifer, but sails to America, and fights for the liberty of the colonies in the Revolutionary war. The Belphegor of classical German literature, finally, has remained unwritten because Mephistopheles, warned by the sad experiences of his cousin, did not venture to listen to the advances of lovely Martha Schwerdlein.

The great importance of Kaufringer's poem

<sup>13</sup> Most recent writers consider Machiavelli's authorship probable, but none has proved it.

<sup>14</sup> Le xlii *Piacevoli Notti del Sig. G. F. Straparola*. ii, 4.

rests in the first place upon the fact that it antedates all other European versions, except the old French, by probably no less than one hundred and fifty years. For while Kaufringer seems to belong to the last part of the fourteenth century, Brevio's novel was printed in 1545, Machiavelli's in 1549 (written before 1527), Straparola's in 1550 and Doni's in 1551. Hans Sachs composed his pieces in 1556 and 1557, and Sansovino published his reprint in 1561. In the second place, Kaufringer's poem together with Holen's version and a Sicilian folk-tale of to-day, are the only versions in which the devil breaks his word right away, and refuses to leave the very first possessed person. Even if Kaufringer knew the Old French version, it cannot have been his only source.

We refrain from extending our comments to other poems of Kaufringer. Until Euling<sup>15</sup> publishes the variants he promised to furnish ten years ago in order to remedy a shortcoming of his edition, students of comparative folk-lore may consult with profit Bebel's *Facetiae* and Crane's edition of *Jacques de Vitry*.

A. GERBER.

Earlham College.

#### FRENCH LITERATURE.

*Manuel de l'Histoire de la Littérature Française*, par FERDINAND BRUNETIÈRE. Paris: Ch. Delagrave, 1898. 8vo, pp. 531.

IN this his latest work, Mr. Brunetière enters upon an entirely new field of study, or at least upon a new method of treatment of a study that he has made his own; namely, the application of the theory of evolution to the history of literature. We may speak of two distinct periods in Mr. Brunetière's career as a critic. In the first he established certain principles, or "idées fondamentales," by means of which he formed his judgments and which account for the severity, bitterness, antagonism, and his claim to exercise an authority in literary matters, so conspicuous in his writings from 1875-1890. It is during this first period that he was groping in the dark, vainly seeking to formulate a theory which would embody his principles. His erudition had until now aided

<sup>15</sup> *Heinrich Kaufringers Gedichte*, p. ix.